

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated October 19, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 19, 22-24, and 26-31 under 35 USC 103 as unpatentable over the combination of Nishiguchi (US Patent 5,214,308) in view of Abe et. al., (US Patent 6,288,444), rejected claims 20 and 25 under 35 USC 103 as unpatentable over Nishiguchi in view of Abe and further in view of Kato (US Patent 6,486,562), rejected claim 21 under USC 103 as unpatentable over Nishiguchi, Abe and Morihara (US patent 5,495,439), rejected claims 32-34 and 43 under 35 USC 103 as unpatentable over Nishiguchi, Abe and Chiu (6,391,683), rejected claims 35, 36, 37, and 39 under 35 USC 103 as unpatentable over Nishiguchi and Holzapfel (US Patent 5,872,633), rejected claim 38 under 35 USC 103 as unpatentable over Nishiguchi, Holzapfel, and Kato (US Patent 6,486,562), and rejected claims 40-42 under 35 USC 103 as unpatentable over Nishiguchi and Holzapfel.

The applicants filed a Notice of Appeal on November 14, 2005. In preparing the appeal brief, the attorney noticed an error in the claims of the present application. Claims 38-43 should be dependent on independent claim 35, not claim 34. The Applicants have amended claims 38-43 to correct this error. The attorney for the Applicants is grateful for the Examiner's agreement to enter these amendments after final as discussed in a telephone interview on November 16, 2005.

Due to the change in dependency of the claims, the attorney for the Applicants assumes that the references used to reject claims 38-43 will also change. Base claim 35 was rejected based on the combination of Nishiguchi and Holzapfel. None of the claims 38-43, however, were rejected using the Holzapfel reference. Instead, they were rejected based on a combination of the other above listed references. Presumably the claims 38-43 will be rejected based on the combination of Holzapfel in addition to the other references previously used to reject the claims respectively.

For the convenience of the Examiner, the attorney for the applicant has created a table that lists for each claim the references previously used in the rejection and those that will presumably be used in the new rejection.

| Claim Number | Previous Rejection | Presumed New Rejection |
|--------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 38 | Nishiguchi, Abe and Kato | Nishiguchi, Abe, Kato and Holzapfel |
| 39 | Nishiguchi and Abe | Nishiguchi, Abe, and Holzapfel |
| 40 | Nishiguchi and Abe | Nishiguchi, Abe, and Holzapfel |
| 41 | Nishiguchi and Abe | Nishiguchi, Abe, and Holzapfel |
| 42 | Nishiguchi and Abe | Nishiguchi, Abe, and Holzapfel |
| 43 | Nishiguchi, Abe and Chui | Nishiguchi, Abe, Chui and Holzapfel |

The attorney for the applicants once again thanks the Examiner for entering the amendments to the claims.

The attorney for the applicants also requests confirmation of the references used to reject claims 38-43 for the record.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

James W. Rose
Reg. No. 34,939

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(650) 961-8300